

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 and 5-8 currently remain in the application. Claims 2 and 4 have been canceled. Claims 1, 5 and 6 are herein amended.

The matter of claims objections in Paragraph 4 on page 3 of the Official Letter is believed to be mostly herein addressed to. As to the correction of line 7 of claim 1, however, the correction suggested by the Examiner (replacing "storing a program to be processed" by --storing said program to be processed--) would make the claim language indefinite because expression "program to be processed" has no precedent basis and hence should not be preceded by "said". Thus, original expression "storing a program to be processed" is herein replaced by --storing said program--. This way of amending is believed to be more acceptable according to the PTO policy, and the Examiner is expected to agree.

Regarding the corrections suggested by the Examiner of line 28 of claim 1, line 15 of claim 5 and line 29 of claim 6, the undersigned attorney apologizes to the Examiner for having unwittingly committed an editorial error in the REMARKS section of the earlier submitted document entitled Amendment "C" wherein statement "from the left-hand side" on line 22 should have read as --from the right-hand side--. This error should obviously be corrected because, as supported by Figs. 9-11 and the portion of the specification at lines 14-23 of page 10, if a structure relationship and its circuit (definition or instance) are simultaneously displayed and thereafter a function block (FB) in the circuit is selected, the corresponding FB in the structure is displayed with emphasis. In other words, if FB in the right-hand circuit is selected, the corresponding FB in the structure relationship on the left-hand side is displayed with emphasis. Claims 1, 5 and 6 are therefore amended in view of the Examiner's objection but more for correcting the editorial error which made the true characteristics of the invention much harder to comprehend. Expressions "editing" and "monitoring" are used in the above-referenced portion of the specification but the Examiner will understand that expressions "instance" and "definition" are used in the claims section for the convenience of presentation.

Claims 1, 3 and 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Eldridge in Kodosky. Independent claims 1, 5 and 6 are herein amended to make it easier to understand more correctly that the present invention comprises a distinguishable characteristic of displaying a structure and

its circuit simultaneously and, if a function block in this circuit is selected thereafter, displaying this selected function block with emphasis. It is believed that neither of the cited references discloses or even hints at such a characteristic feature of the present invention and hence the Examiner will find these presently amended independent claims to be patentable even if these cited references are considered in combination.

The dependent claims which depend from these amended independent claims should be automatically deemed also allowable.

It is therefore believed that the instant Amendment is totally responsive to the Office Action and that the application is now in condition for allowance.

It is requested that the Examiner issue at least an advisory action, if not a notice of allowance, in a seasonable manner in view of the mailing of the instant Amendment within two months of the mailing date of said Final Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP
/kn/

Keiichi Nishimura
Registration No. 29,093

June 3, 2009
500 12th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, California 94607
Telephone: (510) 663-1100
Telefax: (510) 663-0920